



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,689	07/28/2003	Noriaki Matsunaga	790001-2034	5171
20999	7590	03/22/2005	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			PHAM, HOAI V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,689

Applicant(s)

MATSUNAGA ET AL.

Examiner

Hoai v. Pham

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9, 11-17, 20 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) 10, 18, 19 and 22-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Lines 10-11 and 13, "the second interlayer insulating film" should be changed to -- the second interlayer insulating layer-- for clarifying the scope of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 10, 22 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bjorkman et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,340,435] newly cited.

With respect to claim 10, Bjorkman et al. (fig. 1H, cols. 5-7) discloses a semiconductor device comprising:

a semiconductor substrate (not shown) (see col. 3, lines 18-20 and col. 11, lines 33-35);

an interlayer insulating film formed on the semiconductor substrate, the interlayer insulating film comprising a first insulating film (10) and a second insulating film (12) formed on the first insulating film, the first insulating film (10) containing carbon

Art Unit: 2814

of a concentration, the second insulating film (12) containing carbon of a concentration lower than the concentration of the first insulating film (10) (see col. 5, lines 47-60),

wherein a metal wiring (28, 30) of a metal material embedded in a wiring groove formed in the interlayer insulating film, a width of the wiring groove in the first insulating film (10) being smaller than that in the second insulating film (12) at an interface between the first insulating film (10) and the second insulating film (12) (see fig. 1H and col. 7, lines 13-20), and

the width of the wiring groove in the first insulating film (10) is substantially constant, and the width of the wiring groove in the second insulating film (12) is substantially constant (see fig. 1H).

With respect to claim 22, Bjorkman et al. (fig. 1H, cols. 5-7) discloses a semiconductor device comprising:

a semiconductor substrate (not shown) (see col. 3, lines 18-20 and col. 11, lines 33-35);

a first interlayer insulating layer (18) formed on the semiconductor substrate, and having a first wiring (16) formed on a surface of the first interlayer insulating layer (18) (see fig. 1H and col. 5, lines 63-65);

a second interlayer insulating layer formed on the first interlayer insulating layer (18), and comprising a first insulating film (10) and a second insulating film (12) formed on the first insulating film (10), the first insulating film (10) containing carbon of a

concentration, the second insulating film (12) containing carbon of a concentration lower than the concentration of the first insulating film (10) (see col. 5, lines 47-60),

a via contact (22, 26) embedded in a via hole which extends through the second interlayer insulating layer (12) and at least a portion of which is formed on the first wiring (28, 30), and a second wiring (28, 30) embedded in a wiring groove which extends through the second and first insulating films and which is formed on a surface of the second interlayer insulating layer (see fig. 1H and col. 7, lines 13-20);

wherein a width of the second wiring groove in the first insulating film (10) is smaller than that in the second insulating film (12) at an interface between the first insulating film (10) and the second insulating film (12) (see fig. 1H), and

the width of the second wiring groove in the first insulating film (10) is substantially constant, and the width of the wiring groove in the second insulating film (12) is substantially constant (see fig. 1H).

With respect to claims 25-26, Bjorkman et al. discloses that the first insulating film (10) is made of methyl siloxane, SiOCH, SiOC, CF, or CN(H), and the second insulating film (12) is made of SiO₂ or SiOCH, and low in carbon concentration (see col. 5, lines 47-60).

With respect to claims 27-28, Bjorkman et al. discloses that the metal wiring (30) is made of Cu or Cu alloy (see col. 7, lines 29-30).

With respect to claims 28-29, Bjorkman et al. discloses that the first insulating film (10) includes a silicon oxide film (see col. 5, lines 47-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 18-19 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjorkman et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,340,435] newly cited, in view of Cronin et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,590,290] previously applied.

Kojima et al. discloses all the limitation as claimed above except the limitation recited in claims 18-19 and 23-24. However, Cronin et al. discloses all the limitation as recited in claims 18-19 and 23-24 including:

two or more of the second wirings (60) are provided in a side-by-side arrangement, and, when A denotes a width of the first insulating film (44) between adjacent second wirings, at the interface between the first insulating film (44) and the second insulating film (48), in a direction of the side-by-side arrangement of the second wirings, a difference in width between the first insulating layer and the second insulating film, is $A/2$ or less ; and the second wiring (60) is embedded in the wiring groove with an interlaid barrier metal (58), and the via contact is embedded in the via hole with an interlaid barrier metal (58); and a difference in width between the first insulating film and the second insulating film, at the interface between the first insulating film (44) and the second insulating film (48), is $2T$ or more, where T denotes a film thickness of each of the interlaid barrier metals (see fig.15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the limitation as taught by Cronin et al. into the device of Kojima et al. to form a multiple wirings an appropriate space between wirings. Moreover, the width range of the first and second insulating films would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan practicing the invention because, absent evidence of disclosure of criticality for the range giving unexpected results, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed dimensions of any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is aid to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. See *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 18-19, and 22-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoai v. Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-1715. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2814

11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hoai Pham', with a stylized, flowing script.

HOAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER